

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

KAHASAYE ARAYA,
Plaintiff,

v.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY CHILD
SUPPORT SERVICES
DEPARTMENT,

Defendants

Case No. 2:25-cv-00591-SB-AGR
ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS
AND RECOMMENDATION OF
MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Complaint, records on file, the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (R&R) and the objections. Further, the Court has engaged in a *de novo* review of those portions of the R&R to which objections have been made. The findings and recommendations of the R&R are accepted in full.

Plaintiff has asserted numerous objections that largely reiterate previously asserted arguments and fail to demonstrate any material error. To the extent that he attempts to recast his claims or present new theories (*see, e.g.*, Dkt. No. 55 at 11, 16, 26, 30), this is improper. *See Greenhow v. Secretary of HHS*, 863 F.2d 633, 638 (9th Cir. 1988) (“[A]llowing parties to litigate fully their case before the magistrate and, if unsuccessful, to change their strategy and present a different theory to the district court would frustrate the purpose of the Magistrates Act. We

1 do not believe that the Magistrates Act was intended to give litigants an opportunity
2 to run one version of their case past the magistrate, then another past the district
3 court.”). In any event, all claims asserted—even as recharacterized—are barred by
4 the *Younger* abstention doctrine.

5 Plaintiff’s objection to the dismissal of his claims without leave to amend is
6 also meritless. Dkt. No. 55 at 23. When reviewing a pro se complaint, “district
7 courts are only required to grant leave to amend if a complaint can possibly be
8 saved.” *Lopez v. Smith*, 203 F.3d 1122, 1129 (9th Cir. 2000). For the reasons
9 stated in the R&R, the deficiencies in the complaint cannot be cured, and Plaintiff
10 has not demonstrated otherwise.

11 The Court therefore accepts the findings and recommendation of the R&R.

12 IT THEREFORE IS ORDERED that

13 (1) the Los Angeles County Child Support Services Department’s motion to
14 dismiss the complaint is GRANTED;

15 (2) Claims One, Three, Four, Fourteen, and Fifteen are dismissed with
16 prejudice;

17 (3) The remaining claims are dismissed without prejudice and without leave
18 to amend pursuant to *Younger* abstention; and

19 (4) Plaintiff’s ex parte application to terminate income withholding and cease
20 child support enforcement is DENIED.

21 DATED: October 23, 2025



22 STANLEY BLUMENFELD, JR.
23 United States District Judge
24
25
26
27
28